DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 968 UD 020 910

AUTHOR Benson, Jonathon L.: And Others
TITLE Citizen Participation for Urban Management. Modules 1-3. Instructor's Manual.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Mershon Center.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. Office of Policy Development and Research.: National Training and Development Service for State and Local Government, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 55p.: For a related document see UD 020 909.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation: *Government (Administrative Body): Postsecondary Education: *Public Administration Education: Public Agencies: Teaching Guides: *Urban Areas: Workshops

ABSTRACT

This manual was written to accompany workshop curricular materials concerning the design and implementation of alternate forms of citizen participation mechanisms. The materials were prepared for use with management-level and pre-service personnel involved in urban management within a political environment. Three curricular modules are presented in this manual. Module I, "An Overview of Citizen Participation," introduces issues pertaining to the involvement of citizens in governmental planning and decision making. Module II, "Communicating with Citizens," covers problems and issues affecting meaningful communication between citizens and governmental agencies. Module III, "Citizen Participation Mechanisms," examines the advantages and disadvantages of different citizen participation strategies. The manual includes an introduction and background information, discussions of intended audiences and factors affecting course design, a preworkshop needs assessment, instructional methodologies, and evaluation materials. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AUG 13 1980

ED191968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION FOR URBAN MANAGEMENT

MODULES 1 - 3

Developed by

THE MERSHON CENTER

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

DR. JONATHON L. BENSON
DR. PHILIP M. BURGESS
DR. RICHARD A. CONWAY
DR. THOMAS E. JAMES, JR.
DR. LAWRENCE L. SLONAKER

Under Contract to

THE URBAN MANAGEMENT CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

THE NATIONAL TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

5028 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20016

Funded by

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

UDO 20910

Package VII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction and Background	VII.1
	A. Introduction	VII.1
	B. Orientation of the Curriculum	VII.1
	C. The Content of the Curriculum	VII.2
II.	Intended Audiences	VII.5
III.	Factors Affecting Course Design	VII.6
	A. Nature and Composition of the Audience	VII.6
	B. Time Parameters for Training	VII.8
	C. Instructional Setting	VII.10
IV.	Pre-Workshop Needs Assessment	VII.11
V.	Instructional Methodology	VII.19
	A. Introduction	VII.19
	B. Module I: Overview of Citizen Participation	VII.21
	C. Module II: Communicating With Citizens	VII.30
	D. Module III: Citizen Participation Mechanisms	VII.32
VI.	Evaluation	VII.42
	Bibliography	VII.48

FIGURES

1. Figure 1: Overview Module Needs Assessment Composite Interest/Rank Score VII.17

2. Figure 2: Responses to Cynicism Items, 1964-1976 . . . . VII.25

I. Introduction and Background

A. Introduction

This curriculum provides information concerning the design and implementation of alternative forms of citizen participation mechanisms. It is based on the need of urban managers for a clarification and expansion of the options available for establishing coherent, effective approaches to involving citizens in the processes of government.

This course is not a cookbook or a list of steps that when followed, achieve a certain result. Rather, the material contained in the Participant's Manual provides information and guidelines to facilitate the process of evaluating alternative mechanisms and selecting the mechanism(s) most appropriate to a specific situation. The overall objective is to provide information that will increase the leadership and management capacity of urban managers to deal with citizen participation.

With the overall objective in mind, the following material is presented from the perspective of the urban manager operating in a political environment. By nature this environment is not sterile or value free. Competing claims are being continuously made for a finite amount of resources; somebody is always going to be unhappy with the decisions about how the resources are allocated. Citizen participation affords the urban manager the opportunity to get the competing claims on the table, gauge the support to the various claims, and attempt to mediate a solution.

This manual is designed to be an aid to a potential instructor for the course entitled, Citizen Participation for Urban Management. The first section of the Instructor's Manual outlines the educational objectives of the curriculum and provides an overview of the curricular materials. The second section describes the major types of users for which this course was developed. The third section describes factors that might affect the actual design of this course for a specific audience. The fourth section contains materials that a potential instructor might use to assess the training needs of potential course participants. The instructor should pay close attention to the third and fourth sections because in order for this course to be effective, it needs to be tailored to the training needs and situations of the course participants. The fifth section contains ideas a potential instructor could use in presenting the course. This section is not intended to be a step-by-step delineation of the variety of instructional strategies that could be used in any situation. Rather, it contains ideas from which an instructor might pick and choose when designing a course to meet the needs of a specific training situation. The sixth section contains material an instructor might use to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum. And finally, a brief section has been included which contains an overview of selected instructional resources that an instructor might refer to when preparing this curriculum.

B. Orientation of the Curriculum

The curriculum reflects an orientation toward citizen participation that emphasizes a number of major considerations. First, any effort to

design and implement a citizen participation program or strategy must carefully relate the desired purposes or objectives of citizen participation to the strategies and mechanisms used to accomplish those purposes. Not all strategies and mechanisms are equally well suited to serve the same purposes.

Second, because of the diversity within communities, a single citizen participation mechanism is usually inadequate for achieving meaningful and broad-based citizen participation in a community. A broad approach to citizen participation incorporating a mixture of mechanisms and strategies is likely to be far more effective than an approach that is narrowly conceived.

Third, because of the diversity among communities and the constantly changing conditions within communities, it is inappropriate to attempt to devise a citizen participation "cookbook." It is more appropriate to provide information to facilitate the process of choosing from among alternative mechanisms. The mechanism(s) that meets the needs of a particular situation then can be adapted to the specific conditions surrounding that situation.

Fourth, successful citizen participation efforts require a great deal of work and commitment. Care needs to be taken in the design and implementation of citizen participation efforts, and this requires that any citizen participation mechanism or strategy be constantly evaluated and refined.

C. The Content of the Curriculum

The curriculum is divided into three major modules which, though related, can be presented independently. The three major modules are described below and include:

- Module I: An Overview of Citizen Participation
- Module II: Communicating With Citizens
- Module III: Citizen Participation Mechanisms

Module I provides an overview to some of the issues in citizen participation. In this overview, the urban manager is introduced to a number of issues pertaining to the involvement of citizens in governmental planning and decisionmaking:

- What is citizen participation, and why should the urban manager be concerned about it?
- What has been the evolution of citizen participation as mandated by Federal legislation?
- What are the functions that citizen participation can serve?

- What are the benefits and constraints, both to government and citizens, of involving citizens in the everyday processes of government?

- Finally, what are the various factors that one must take into consideration in order to facilitate effective citizen participation efforts?

All public involvement efforts involve some sort of communication between public officials and citizens. Given the importance of this activity, Module II covers problems and issues affecting meaningful communication. This Module helps the urban manager improve the capacity of government to communicate effectively with citizens by concentrating on the planning and use of a range of communication techniques and programs.

Specifically, this Module is divided into three sections:

- The first section presents and discusses a range of communication techniques which can be used in strengthening citizen participation.

- The second section discusses the importance of maintaining credibility when communicating with citizens.

- The third section addresses the need for urban managers to understand the role and perspective of the citizen participant as a legitimate partner in the operations of government.

The third Module on citizen participation mechanisms provides urban managers with information that allows them to examine the advantages and disadvantages of different citizen participation strategies, how these strategies relate to functions of citizen participation, and what major problems or issues are involved in the implementation of these strategies.

This module contains seven parts covering a range of citizen participation mechanisms. The major sections are:

- Temporary Convenings: Task Forces, Blue Ribbon Panels;

- Temporary Convenings: Public Hearings, Public Briefings;

- Functional Continuing Mechanisms: Commissions, Authorities, Boards, and Committees;

- Territorial Groups: Priority Boards, Neighborhood Commissions;

- Decentralization: Administrative and Political;

- Grievance Processing: Ombudsmen and Complaint Bureaus; and

- Surveys.

The discussion of these mechanisms covers the following broad areas:

- a description of the citizen participation mechanisms and how that mechanism relates to different functions of citizen participation;
- questions and problems that arise in the implementation of those mechanisms, such as what type of participants are appropriate, how should participants be selected, and how should the mechanisms be managed in terms of resources and organizations; and
- a case study which illustrates how a certain type of mechanism has actually been used.

II. Intended Audiences

The curricular materials have been prepared in order that they could be used in a number of different settings. For convenience, the term "urban manager" has been used to describe the recipient of the curriculum, and in-service personnel are the primary targets. However, the curriculum could be given at least to three types of participants: 1) top level, in-service management personnel who are intimately involved in legislative and administrative policymaking; 2) in-service middle-management personnel involved in planning and implementation; and 3) pre-service personnel in graduate programs in public administration, urban affairs, or political science.

For example, the curriculum could be given to top level in-service personnel to provide them with a broad overview of the uses of citizen participation, how different strategies and techniques relate to different uses, constraints on the citizen participation process, and how different strategies and techniques could be implemented. This material would help these personnel in making policy decisions about the appropriate citizen participation structure for their city.

In addition, the curriculum could be given to in-service middle-management personnel. In this situation, the instructor may want to concentrate on material from the curriculum dealing with the implementation of the various citizen participation mechanisms.

And finally, the curriculum could be used for pre-service personnel; that is, as part of a graduate course in public administration, urban affairs, or political science. For this type of a group the material could be used to acquaint students with a number of different issues related to citizen participation including Federal requirements, problems in communication, purposes and difficulties in implementation.

The point to remember is that the curriculum can be used for a variety of purposes and for a number of different audiences. It is equally appropriate for audiences who have had some experience in citizen participation as it is for audiences who are generally unfamiliar with citizen participation. However, teaching methods and specific course content will vary depending upon the specific audiences. The next section provides an overview of factors that might affect the design of this course.

III. Factors Affecting Course Design

A variety of factors can affect the design of a specific course. Major factors that should be considered are:

- the nature and composition of the audience;
- the time limits on training; and
- the instructional setting.

The following sections discuss each of these factors and outline issues or problems that might be faced by the instructor.

A. Nature and Composition of the Audience

The nature and composition of the audience can have a major impact on a course and on an instructor's ability to achieve course objectives. This is especially true when the time available for teaching is short. The following factors are important to consider:

- backgrounds of course participants
- the expectations of course participants
- the number of participants
- the heterogeneity or homogeneity of the group

The backgrounds of course participants could have an impact on course planning. Of primary concern are the experiences and biases that participants might bring into the course. Pre-service participants might not have had extensive first-hand experience with citizen participation. Thus, they may be less capable of participating in discussions and of introducing material to supplement discussions. However, pre-service participants may bring fewer pre-conceived notions about citizen participation to the course than would in-service participants.

In-service personnel may have a great deal to contribute to discussions and be valuable resources for the course. However, they may have pre-formed opinions about citizen participation and consequently be less receptive to alternative viewpoints. Generally, participants with strong negative or positive views toward citizen participation will express those views early in the course. The instructor should be prepared for this because it may make the beginning of the course difficult to manage.

A pre-workshop needs assessment questionnaire is included in the next section of the manual. This questionnaire provides an example of how an instructor might collect information from potential participants concerning their backgrounds. In addition information from the needs assessment could be supplemented by informal discussions either with course participants or with those who have arranged to have the course presented.

The expectations of participants will also affect the course design. Participant expectations could be affected by the conditions under which they are taking the course and by the information they have about the course. If the participants have been told by a superior that they will take this course, they might be less than enthusiastic and might have negative expectations. They may do little reading, participate very little in discussions, and fail to carry out any assignments the instructor might give them. In addition, if participants have little or misleading information about the course before it is presented, they might develop expectations that are not congruent with what is actually given.

The instructor can condition the expectations of course participants. It is important to ensure that what the participants' expectations are regarding the course match what the course actually delivers. This can be accomplished by briefing participants about course objectives, content, and format prior to the course. This need not be elaborate. It should also be repeated at the very beginning of the course.

The number of people who participate also needs to be considered by the instructor. In general, medium sized groups (10 to 15 people) are preferred over very small or very large ones. With very small groups often it is difficult to stimulate interesting discussions. A very small group limits the number of different perspectives and experiences that are represented. In addition it is easier for a single individual to dominate a very small group than a medium sized group.

Very large groups also can be difficult to initiate, sustain and manage. Large groups tend to be impersonal and lack the type of intimacy that facilitate discussion. Discussion is very important because an objective of the curriculum is to stimulate participants to assess what they are doing or might be doing in promoting citizen participation.

Consequently, the instructor may wish to place upper and lower limits on course enrollments. If a very large number of people wish to take the course, it may be desirable to present the course to two or more separate groups. The decision about the number of participants should be addressed by each instructor in the context of a particular teaching situation.

Finally, group heterogeneity or homogeneity can also impact on the course. This is particularly true for in-service audiences. Group composition can be considered in several ways. For in-service courses a decision needs to be made about whether to mix officials with different administrative positions. The presence of a high ranking administrator may inhibit the participation of middle-management personnel. In addition, high ranking government personnel may be more interested in citizen participation from a broad policy perspective, while middle-management may be more interested in issues related to the design and implementation of different mechanisms. The major advantage of mixing these two types of participants is that they have the opportunity to be exposed to each other's perspectives.

The instructor may also be faced with the issue of mixing citizen participants with government personnel in the course. In a city that is

having some problems with citizen participation and where there is conflict between citizen participants and government personnel, such a mixture is probably not desirable. Government personnel may feel they have to be very careful about what they say in the presence of citizens and this may restrict discussion. In addition, it is possible that the course could serve as another setting where citizens and government officials clash rather than an instructional setting. Though the interaction between these two types of participants may turn out to be quite productive, the mixture of citizens and government officials will almost inevitably mean that a great deal of time will be taken up discussing issues in the city which may or may not relate to the material being covered. The instructor should be prepared for this if citizens and government personnel are mixed.

The instructor should analyze the composition of the group and strive for a combination of participants that will facilitate discussion. In some cases, this might involve separating potential participants into two groups and offering the course twice.

B. Time Parameters for Training

The time required to present the curricular material will vary depending on the composition of the audience and the specific requirements of the participants. While an entire university semester or quarter course could be constructed around this curriculum, various segments of the material (modules, or sections of modules) could be incorporated into other courses. For in-service personnel, the amount of time required to present the material will to a large degree depend on the results of the needs assessment and the purpose of the workshop. Presenting a few of the mechanisms in detail could take about the same amount of time as a very cursory treatment of the entire curriculum. As much (or little) time as necessary should be spent in order to meet the needs of the participants.

When conducting an in-service workshop, the instructor must also keep in mind other demands on the participant's time. If a large portion of the curriculum is to be presented, it might be better to have short sessions over a longer time period (e.g., two or three hour sessions once or twice a week), than concentrated training periods (all day for four or five days in a row). The shorter sessions have the advantages of:

- not fatiguing the participants as easily as a concentrated week-long workshop; and
- being less disruptive to day-to-day operations. It might be very difficult to free up a group of in-service participants for more than a day at a time.

On the other hand, they have the disadvantages of:

- taking a longer time to cover the material (maybe a month or more); and
- the problem of maintaining interest and continuity over a longer time period.

The instructor will have to evaluate the conditions surrounding each training situation and determine (along with the participants and the person who asked for the workshop) the most appropriate time frame for presenting the curriculum. The following time estimates are suggested minimum time requirements for presenting the various sections and modules. Within the time estimated, the instructor should be able to make the major points covered in the material and allow for some discussion by the participants. The amount of material presented by the instructor and the amount of discussion by the participants will determine whether the time spent on a particular section is longer or shorter than the minimum estimates.

Module I - Overview to Citizen Participation	4 1/4 - 5 hours
A. Introduction	1/2 hour
B. What Is Citizen Participation	1/2 - 3/4 hour
C. Why Should We Have Citizen Participation	1 1/2 hours
D. The Development of Citizen Participation Through Federal Legislation	3/4 - 1 hour
E. Facilitating Effective Citizen Participation	1 - 1 1/4 hours
Module II - Communicating With Citizens	4 1/4 hours
A. Communications: Its Role in Citizen Participation	1/2 hour
B. Communication Techniques	1/2 hour
C. Local Government Credibility	1/2 hour
D. Role Perspectives	1/2 hour
E. Summary	1/4 hour
Module III - Citizen Participation Mechanisms	17 hours
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Overview	1/2 hour
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Long-Term Convenings	3 hours

Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Short-Term Convenings	1 hour
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Territorial Groups	3 hours
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Functional Continuing Mechanisms	1 1/2 hours
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Decentralization	2 hours
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Grievance Processing	2 1/2 hours
Citizen Participation Mechanisms: Surveys	3 1/2 hours

C. Instructional Setting

When this curriculum is taught in a university setting for pre-service personnel, the sessions will generally be held in a regular classroom. However, if certain types of participation mechanisms are operating in the city (e.g., neighborhood site offices, public hearings, mini-city halls, area commissions, etc.), it might be useful and interesting to hold some class sessions observing these mechanisms in action. This will allow the participants to observe first hand some of the key elements discussed in the classroom.

When conducting a workshop for in-service personnel, the instructional setting becomes very important. There is a disadvantage to holding a workshop for public officials in the building where they work. Participants are likely to be going in and out of the sessions to respond to phone calls and to take care of other business. Not only can this be disruptive for the other participants, but it is difficult to maintain continuity. Someone comes back into the session from taking a phone call and asks a question that has just been answered and discussed. If time is taken to answer the question again, the other participants get bored. If the question isn't answered, the individual asking it might miss an important point.

If the material is presented in a series of short sessions, the problem of interruption is manageable. Most people can free up a two or three hour block of time. On the other hand, if the workshop is being given over continuous periods of time (all day for a week), it is better to choose an instructional setting away from where the participants work. When the participants are in a meeting room at a local hotel and away from phones and other people making demands on their time, they are much more likely to concentrate their energies on the workshop activities.

IV. Pre-Workshop Needs Assessment

The material presented in this curriculum should be tailored to the particular needs of the course participants. It may not be appropriate or necessary to teach every section of every module to a given audience. City officials (that is, in-service personnel) who participate in a citizen participation workshop might already know the reasons, benefits, and constraints of involving citizens. Their concerns and interests might be with the alternative mechanisms that are available to them. In this instance, it would be most beneficial to the participants if the bulk of the time is spent discussing issues related to participation mechanisms. On the other hand, a pre-service course (e.g., a college course) might include the entire curriculum. The material could stand alone as a course or be included as a major portion of another course.

When adapting the curriculum material for use in an in-service course, a needs assessment will aid the instructor in the process of selecting those modules or sections that will meet the expressed needs of the participants. The more responsive the course is to the content preferences of the audience, the more likely it is that the participants will be actively involved in course activities such as reading background material, completing exercises, asking questions, and joining in discussions. The needs assessment should be distributed to the participants early enough so that they can be returned to the instructor in time to allow for planning the workshop.

The following is an illustrative needs assessment instrument. With the information gathered by the assessment, the instructor will have a profile of the audience--e.g., occupation, previous experience with citizen participation, reason for taking the workshop, and expectations--as well as an indication of content preferences.

When the needs assessments are returned, a simple tabulation of the information contained in the participant profile will provide the instructor with a profile of the background and experiences of the participants. For example, if the participants are taking the workshop because they were told to take it, rather than voluntarily, or if a number of participants have had bad experiences with citizen participation, the instructor should spend time at the outset explaining to the participants why this workshop is valuable and relevant to them.

The next section of the needs assessment indicates the degree of participant interest in the various topic areas as well as their preference for topics to be discussed. This information is very useful when preparing the workshop. If the amount of time available to present the material is limited, the needs assessment data can help in determining what topics to include and what to exclude. If the entire curriculum is going to be presented, the instructor might want to devote more time to the high interest/high priority topics and give just a general overview or summary of the low interest/low priority topics.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PRE-WORKSHOP NEEDS ASSESSMENT

I. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

1. Occupation (include years experience):

2. Educational Level (highest degree received):

3. Briefly describe any experiences you have had in the area of citizen participation:

4. Please list any previous education and/or training in the area of citizen participation.

5. Why are you taking this workshop and what do you expect to get out of it?

II. CONTENT PREFERENCE

The curriculum is divided into three major modules: an Overview Module, a Communications Module, and a Mechanisms Module. Major topics covered in each module are listed below. For the topic areas within each module, we would like you to do the following:

- indicate on the scale provided the degree of interest you have in each topic; and
- list the topic areas within each module you would most like to have covered in the workshop.

MODULE I
AN OVERVIEW OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

1. On the scale that follows circle the number that best describes how interested you are in having that topic area covered in the workshop.

	Very Interested	Somewhat Interested	Not Very Interested	Not At All Interested
A. Alternative Definitions and Conceptions of Citizen Participation	1	2	3	4
B. Purposes, Benefits, Functions, and Constraints of Citizen Participation	1	2	3	4
C. The Impact of Federal Legislation on the Development of Citizen Participation	1	2	3	4
D. Factors that have an Impact on Effective Citizen Participation	1	2	3	4

2. Please rank each of the topic areas listed above with the topic you would like to see covered most listed first, the topic you would like to see covered second most listed second, and so on. Just write down the letter that corresponds to the appropriate topic area.

1. _____ (topic I would like to see covered most)
2. _____ (topic I would like to see covered second most)
3. _____ (topic I would like to see covered third most)
4. _____ (topic I would like to see covered fourth most)

MODULE II
COMMUNICATING WITH CITIZENS

1. On the scale that follows circle the number that best describes how interested you are in having that topic area covered in the workshop.

	Very Interested	Somewhat Interested	Not Very Interested	Not At All Interested
A. Communication Techniques	1	2	3	4
B. Promoting Local Government Credibility	1	2	3	4
C. Differences in Role Perspectives Between Governmental Officials and Citizens	1	2	3	4

2. Please rank each of the topic areas listed above with the topic you would like to see covered most listed first, the topic you would like to see covered second most listed second, and so on. Just write down the letter that corresponds to the appropriate topic area.

1. _____ (topic I would like to see covered most)
2. _____ (topic I would like to see covered second most)
3. _____ (topic I would like to see covered third most)

MODULE III

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION MECHANISMS

1. On the scale that follows circle the number that best describes how interested you are in having that topic area covered in the workshop.

		Very Interested	Somewhat Interested	Not Very Interested	Not At All Interested
A.	Long Term Convenings: Task Forces, Blue Ribbon Panels	1	2	3	4
B.	Short Term Convenings: Public Hearings and Public Briefings	1	2	3	4
C.	Functional Continuing Mechanisms: Boards, Commissions, Authorities, Committees	1	2	3	4
D.	Territorial Groups: Priority Boards, Neighborhood Commissions	1	2	3	4
E.	Administrative and Political Decentralization: Mini-City Halls, Branch Service Facilities, and Multi-service Centers	1	2	3	4
F.	Grievance Processing: Ombudsmen and Complaint Bureaus	1	2	3	4
G.	Surveys	1	2	3	4

2. Please rank each of the topic areas listed above with the topic you would like to see covered most listed first, the topic you would like to see covered second most listed second, and so on. Just write down the letter that corresponds to the appropriate topic area.

1. _____ (topic I would like to see covered most)
2. _____ (topic I would like to see covered second most)
3. _____ (topic I would like to see covered third most)
4. _____ (topic I would like to see covered fourth most)
5. _____ (topic I would like to see covered fifth most)
6. _____ (topic I would like to see covered sixth most)
7. _____ (topic I would like to see covered seventh most)

In order for content preference information to be maximally useful, the information about the degree of interest in a particular topic should be considered in conjunction with the rank order of presentation of that topic. A participant might be very interested in every topic in the Overview Module but not enough time is available to cover every topic. Consideration of the rank orderings of the topics will aid in selecting the topics to cover.

One way to take both interest and rank into account is to generate a composite score for each topic area for each participant. This can be done by multiplying the degree of interest score for a topic by the rank order of that topic. Figure 1 displays the score for the Overview Module. For example, Participant 1 marked "somewhat interested" (a score of 2) for topic A and ranked that topic third in priority. Thus, 2 x 3 = 6. On the other hand, Participant 2 was "very interested" (1) in topic A and ranked it second; this provides a score of 2 (1 x 2 = 2).

By summing the participants scores for each topic area and dividing by the number of participants, we get an overall mean or average for the topic. The lower the mean the greater the interest and the higher the priority ranking of the particular topic. In this instance, topic D (Factors That Have An Impact on Effective Citizen Participation) has the most interest and highest priority. The "Impact of Federal Legislation" ranks last and would be a likely candidate to be dropped if time constraints were a factor.

The standard deviation of the scores for a topic can be calculated with the formula:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma \ (X_i - \mu)^2}{N}}$$

where Σ = sum of

X_i = each participants score on the topic

μ = the mean score of the topic

N = the number of participants

In other words, for each topic:

- Take a participants score and subtract it from the overall mean for the topic.
- Square the result.
- Do this for each participant and add up the scores.

FIGURE 1: Overview Module Needs Assessment Composite Interest/Rank Score

Topics \ Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A. Alternative Definitions	6	2	8	8	6	1	3	3	3
B. Purposes, Benefits, Functions, Constraints	1	6	2	4	2	2	2	2	1
C. Federal Legislation	4	1	6	6	12	3	4	8	4
D. Factors for Effective Citizen Participation	2	4	1	1	1	4	1	1	2

Topic	Mean	Standard Deviation
A	4.44	2.45
B	2.44	1.49
C	5.33	3.01
D	1.88	1.19

- Divide the total by the number of participants.
- Take the square root of the result.

The standard deviation is a measure of dispersion and gives the instructor an indication of the amount of agreement concerning the interest and priority of a given topic. The lower the standard deviation, the more agreement. This can be particularly useful if two topic areas have about the same mean score. Perhaps the time constraints of a workshop will only permit discussing three of the seven mechanisms. Two mechanisms--surveys and grievance processing--are tied for the third ranking with mean scores of 5.00. Surveys has a standard deviation of 2.3 and grievance processing has a standard deviation of 4.7. While the overall score for interest/priority is the same for both, more agreements exist among the participants about the surveys than grievance processing. Thus, the instructor might decide to include a discussion of surveys but not grievance processing.

It is important to remember that the information gathered through the needs assessment is meant to aid the instructor in preparing the workshop. This information must be considered along with other input. If the chief executive of a city has decided to begin using surveys as a way to collect information from citizens, the instructor might decide to include that topic regardless of its ranking by the participants.

V. Instructional Methodology

A. Introduction

A variety of instructional techniques are available to the curriculum instructor. The appropriate technique(s) used during a session will depend on the purpose (increase awareness, etc.), the difficulty of the material, and the amount of relevant knowledge the participants already have. The following discussion presents some of the techniques that can be used to present the curricular material.

1. Reading

It is expected that the participants will read the appropriate sections from the participant's manual before the class or workshop meets. Depending on the background and information needs of a specific group, the instructor may want to selectively assign readings from the participant's manual. Further, additional sources of information are provided at the end of the instructor's manual. These sources can be used by the instructor in preparing for the training sessions and/or assigned to the participants as additional reading. The use of outside sources by the participants will depend, in part, on the amount of time available. Outside assignments are much easier to handle with pre-service people in a college course than with in-service people participating in a workshop.

2. Lecture

Lecture is appropriate in some situations. In these situations the instructor carries the burden of explaining, building relationships, and answering questions. A lecture is generally used when the instructor's objective is to pass on information that the participants do not have. The lecture provides the background for the discussion portion of a session and allows the instructor to capture the group's attention and direct their thinking to the question or problem to be discussed. The amount of time devoted to lecture will depend on the background and level of information possessed by the participants. In general, more lecture time will be required for pre-service personnel than for in-service personnel.

3. Group Discussion

In a group discussion the instructor's objective may be to: 1) get the group to make a decision or arrive at conclusions on a subject through an exchange of ideas or opinions; or 2) use the discussion for the purpose of general education over a range of related topics. The emphasis is on the development of awareness, familiarity, and understanding. A well-conducted discussion session has a number of advantages:

- it encourages participation from the entire group and fosters two-way communication;

- it stimulates thinking as opposed to passive acceptance;
- it permits pooling of ideas and experience, exerting a broadening effect on participants;
- it brings about modification of viewpoints and changes attitudes, interest, values, etc.;
- it provides a means of trying out ideas and opinions and developing understanding; and
- it provides a means of maintaining high interest.

There are many causes of wasted time during a discussion. People can get off the subject, discussion can bog down in confusion over meanings, discussion can be shallow, etc. Consequently, the instructor must be prepared for the meetings and:

- have expertise in leading small group discussions;
- have a firm grasp of the instructional material in order to guide and pull together the discussion to ensure that all the important material is covered; and
- have developed a set of questions, games, or handouts that can be used to stimulate discussion.

4. Case Studies

Case studies can be used to illustrate specific points being made in the curriculum. They allow participants to examine and analyze a specific situation and speculate as to what affected the outcomes. In addition, participants can speculate as to how the situation might have been handled differently.

5. Outside Speakers

Inviting guests with practical experience to meet with the group is a good method for providing information and maintaining interest. Speakers can also be brought in after the participants have covered a particular module. At this point the participants are in a position of having acquired some background information and are better able to ask questions and engage in discussion. A number of guests representing a variety of viewpoints could be invited throughout the course of the class or workshop--e.g., public officials who have been engaged in citizen participation programs, as well as citizens who have been involved in participation efforts. The opportunity for participants to meet these guests provides them with a living "case study" with whom they can interact.

Up to this point, the discussion of instructional methodology has taken a broad focus. The sections that follow discuss each of the modules

individually and offer suggestions concerning how the material might be covered.

The suggestions are primarily directed towards an in-service audience, although some could also be used for pre-service audiences. In addition, for each section, we have estimated the minimum amount of time needed to cover all the material in the section.

B. Module I: Overview of Citizen Participation

1. Topic: Introduction (TEXT: I. 1-12)

a. Objectives

The major objectives of this section are to:

- provide an introduction to some of the major concepts associated with citizen participation; and
- provide an introduction to the orientation and context of the curriculum.

b. Estimated Time--1/2 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

The overall goal of this module is to provide a basic introduction and background to some of the key issues associated with citizen participation. Many of the concepts and issues that are introduced in this module are discussed in more detail later in the curriculum. The material presented in the overview provides a common ground or baseline for the presentation and discussion of the more specific design information to follow.

The teaching methodology used for the introduction will be basically lecture with some discussion. The instructor should use the Clarkville case study to illustrate some of the key elements that typically surround citizen participation efforts. For instance, this example illustrates:

- that public officials wanted citizen involvement, but did not devote sufficient energy into implementing that effort;
- the importance of spending time in planning and designing the most appropriate participation program;
- the need for good two-way communication between citizens and officials;

- the political context of citizen participation; and
- the relationship of form to function.

After covering the events of the case study and pointing out the important elements, the instructor could ask if any of the participants had been involved in citizen participation efforts. Ask participants to relate their experiences with the various elements illustrated through the case study.

The Overview to the Curriculum section sets forth some basic assumptions about citizen participation that guided the development of the material. The discussion of key elements could serve as a lead-in for the instructor to talk about the orientation of the curriculum. After showing how these assumptions relate to some of the points made in the case study, the instructor should briefly discuss the content of the curriculum. This will give the participants a sense for where they are going and how the various modules are related to each other.

2. Topic: What is Citizen Participation? (TEXT: I. 13-16)

a. Objective

The participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- various definitions of citizen participation.

b. Estimated Time--1/2-3/4 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

No single definition of citizen participation exists; however, citizen and government officials frequently talk about citizen participation without ever stopping to think about exactly what they mean when they use the term. Since many people have very narrow definitions of participation, the main goal of this section is to broaden the perspective of the participants concerning their concept of citizen participation.

It is not important that the participants agree on a single definition of citizen participation, but rather that they think about and verbalize what they mean by citizen participation. The instructor could start the discussion of this section by asking the participants to define what they mean by citizen participation. As people speak, write the key points of each person's definition on the board and begin looking for common elements. Use the definitions given by participants to note the wide range of ways people conceptualize citizen participation and to point out the danger of a narrow definition--many important forms of participation are eliminated.

After discussing the various definitions offered by the participants, point out those elements that are common to a number of the definitions given. Through this exercise, try to generate a set of elements that most

participants agree are components of citizen participation. Don't spend a lot of time doing this. The important aspect of the activity is to get participants with a very narrow view of participation to enlarge the scope of their outlook.

At the conclusion of this activity ask the participants to step back and evaluate the degree to which their definition of citizen participation is a result of the mindset they brought to the workshop. If the participants include elected officials, some might view citizen participation in narrow terms, emphasizing that citizens participate by electing representatives. This view will require a narrow definition that might be influenced by the fact that the mindset of the individual was that of a public official rather than a citizen trying to impact on the decisions of an official. The point of the discussion is to reinforce the idea that the wide variety of definitions is in part due to the perspective of the individual. Citizens are likely to view their participation in very different terms than most public officials.

3. Topic: Why Should We Have Citizen Participation? (TEXT: I. 17-35)

a. Objectives

The participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- the reasons for promoting citizen participation and the benefits that can accrue to government and citizens;
- the functions citizen participation can serve; and
- the constraints and liabilities associated with involving citizens in governmental planning and decisionmaking.

b. Estimated Time-- 1 1/2 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

This part of the Overview Module has three main subsections:

- The Reasons for Encouraging Citizen Participation;
- The Functions of Citizen Participation; and,
- The Constraints of Citizen Participation

The "Reasons" subsection is a logical extension of the previous discussion concerning alternative definitions. When people define what they mean by participation, they are implicitly and sometimes explicitly stating what they see as the reasons for involving citizens in the process of government. The material in this subsection should be handled primarily through group discussion. The instructor could note that the participants just discussed

alternative definitions of citizen participation and what activities do and do not constitute effective participation. Now answer the questions, "Do we need citizen participation?", and "What should be the role of the citizen in governmental decisionmaking?" The answers to these questions will probably reflect the definitions given in the previous discussion. Those who had narrow definitions of citizen participation will view citizens as having a very limited, and generally passive, role in decisionmaking. Also, they will probably be of the opinion that citizen input is not really needed very much. To the degree that participants are willing to accept a broad definition, they will probably be more likely to say that citizen participation is needed and be able to give a number of reasons. The instructor can also ask the participants for other reasons not mentioned in the participant's manual (e.g., federal requirements).

If the participants are in-service personnel, the instructor could ask them to think about what would happen if elections were the only form of citizen participation available. "What would be the impact on government--both in terms of process and substantive output?" "What would they not be able to do that they can do now?" (e.g., get federal money that requires citizen participation).

One impact of limited opportunities for citizen participation might be to increase alienation. When discussing the reduction of alienation as a reason for promoting increased citizen participation, ask the participants how they view citizen attitudes toward government. Do citizens trust public officials? Are citizens satisfied with how their government is run? Support for the contention that feelings of political efficacy (the feelings that an individual can have an impact on the political process) and political trust (the basic evaluative orientation toward government) are on the decline is evident in the material election studies conducted by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center (Figure 2).

When discussing the data presented in Figure 2, the instructor might ask the participants to estimate how people answered the various questions presented. If a question has been asked in a number of different years, the participants could be asked to indicate what they think the trend of responses has been as well as the distribution of answers for the various years. After the participants have written down their estimates, the instructor can present the actual results. Many public officials believe they have a very accurate perception of what the public thinks. Sometimes this is true and sometimes it is not. This exercise might show that public officials do not always know how citizens feel about an issue.

As the data in Figure 2 indicate, the trend between 1964 and 1970 was toward increasing political distrust or cynicism. Except for the last question (crooked people running the government), the change of responses is in the area of 20 percentage points in the direction of increased cynicism for the period of 1964 to 1970. This overall shift in a more cynical direction is made even more dramatic when compared to a change of only two percentage points to the negative for the preceding six years (1958-1964).

An examination of the available data for the six-year period of 1970 to 1976 confirms that the trend of increasing political distrust is continuing.

FIGURE 2: Responses to Cynicism Items, 1964-1976

1. How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right--just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

	1964	1966	1968	1970	1974	1976
Always	14%	17%	8%	7%	-	-
Most of the time	62	48	53	47	-	-
Only some of the time	22	31	37	44	-	-
Don't know	2	4	2	2	-	-
(N)	(4658)	(1291)	(1557)	(1514)	-	-

2. Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

	1964	1966	1968	1970	1974	1976
For benefit of all	64%	53%	52%	41%	-	22%
Few big interests	29	34	39	49	-	62
Other; depends; both checked	4	6	5	5	-	6
Don't know	3	7	4	5	-	10

3. Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

	1964	1966	1968	1970	1974	1976
Not much	7%	-	4%	4%	1%	-
Some	44	-	33	26	22	-
A lot	46	-	58	68	74	-
Don't know; not ascertained	3	-	5	2	2	-

(Continued on following page...)

4. Do you feel that almost all of the people running the government are smart people who usually know what they are doing, or do you think that quite a few of them don't seem to know what they are doing?

	1964	1966	1968	1970	1974	1976
Know what they're doing	68%	-	56%	51%	-	-
Don't know what they're doing[1]	27	-	36	44	-	-
Other;depends	2	-	2	2	-	-
Don't know; not ascertained	3	-	6	3	-	-

5. Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are a little crooked, not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked at all?

	1964	1966	1968	1970	1974	1976
Hardly any	18%	-	18%	16%	10%	6%
Not many	48	-	49	49	42	24
Quite a lot[1]	28	-	25	31	45	61
Don't know; not ascertained	6	-	8	4	3	9

[1]Indicates response interpreted as "cynical."

[2]The sample size for each of the years applies to all five items. The 1964 N is weighted.

[3]These items were not included in the 1966 election study interview schedule.

[4]Data from a July, 1976, survey conducted by Hart for the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.

In 1976, 62 percent of the population said that "government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves"; this is in contrast to 49 percent who gave the same response in 1970. Further, by 1970, three out of four people interviewed said that people in government waste a lot of money.

In the aftermath of Watergate one would expect the responses to the question about crooked people running the government to match, if not surpass, the movement toward increased cynicism that is apparent in the responses to the other questions. The data for 1974 and 1976 support this expectation. While the percentage of respondents saying "quite a few people running the government are a little crooked" only increased by three percent (28% to 31%) during the six-year period from 1964 to 1970, an increase of 14 percent took place during the next four years, to 1974, with an additional 16 percent giving this response in the two-year period of 1974 to 1976. By 1976, 61 percent of the population felt that quite a few people running the government were crooked--an increase of 30 percent since 1970.

The purpose of the "Functions" subsection is to acquaint the participant with a number of broad functions that can be served by citizen participation. Specification of the function(s) to be served becomes very important when deciding what particular mechanism or technique to use. All too often, those who are interested in setting up a citizen participation structure decide on a mechanism first (e.g., neighborhood commission), and then try to figure out what to do with it.

The instructor could make the major points of this subsection by asking the participants what they view as being the major functions served by citizen participation. The responses will probably be more along the line of specific purposes--e.g., resolve conflict, build support, needs assessment, etc. The instructor can take any specific responses and reword them into more general terms, placing them under one or more of the four broad functions. Use the participant's responses as openings to discuss the material presented under the broad functions.

It is also important for the participant to realize that citizen participation can serve more than one function or specific purpose at the same time. For example, if government officials want to use citizen participation to define and prioritize citizen needs, the participation process can serve all four of the broad functions.

With in-service participants, the instructor could ask for examples of citizen participation that are known to the participants and discuss the functions served by the process.

Many of the constraints of involving citizens in governmental decision-making will have undoubtedly been mentioned during the discussion up to this point. The purpose of the "Constraints" subsection is to briefly summarize the major constraints and liabilities associated with encouraging citizen participation.

This subsection can be handled primarily through group discussion. Ask the participants to state what they see the constraints of citizen

participation to be. For those with experience with citizen participation, what is their evaluation of whether or not the benefits were worth the costs (in money, increased time required to reach a decision, staff requirements)--why or why not? Have the participants brainstorm ways in which some of the constraints could be lessened. For example, one of the major constraints to conducting surveys is the cost of professional expertise in order to ensure that the survey is done properly. It might be possible to get some consulting services donated by a local university. In this way a city department that wants a survey might eliminate much of the design and analysis costs and only have to pay for things like interviewing costs.

4. Topic: The Development of Citizen Participation Through Federal Legislation (TEXT: I. 36-45)

a. Objective

After completing this section, the participant should be more aware of and be able to specify:

- the development of citizen participation in federal legislation

b. Estimated Time--3/4-1 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

This section discusses the citizen participation components of a number of federal grants-to-local-government programs. The approach used to present the material in this section will depend on the audience being addressed. If the participants are pre-service, then a lecture outlining the purposes of each program and the development of the participation components of the various pieces of legislation would be appropriate. This session would be primarily informational in order to provide some background information to the participants. Students could be assigned the task of obtaining copies of legislation and regulations pertaining to various Federal and/or local programs that have citizen participation components but were not in the marual. The results of this search could be used as discussion material following the lecture. For instance, each example could be discussed with reference to:

- the degree of citizen participation required;
- the explicitness of the form input is to take (e.g., hearings, surveys, task forces); and,
- at what points in the process are citizens able to participate (e.g., planning, implementation, evaluation).

If the participants are mainly in-service people, the instructor needs to determine the level of familiarity with the various programs discussed

in the participant's manual. If the participants are familiar with most of the legislation, a brief summary of the major points dealing with citizen participation would be sufficient.

The instructor could ask those participants who have had contact with any of the programs to relate whatever experiences they have had with citizen involvement--how was it done, was it useful, problems that were encountered, and things that should have been done differently. In addition, the instructor should ask participants to share any information they have about citizen participation components of programs not specifically mentioned in the manual. Ask the participants to evaluate the Federal government's efforts at promoting citizen input; i.e., has progress been made since the Urban Renewal Program or is citizen participation just a pro forma exercise?

If time requirements are tight, this section could either be cut or covered very briefly. The information presented in this section provides an interesting background about some of the Federal government's efforts, but is not necessary for understanding other segments of the curriculum.

5. Topic: Facilitating Effective Citizen Participation
(TEXT: I. 46-50)

a. Objective

After completing this section, the participant should be more aware of and be able to specify:

- design factors to be considered in order to facilitate effective citizen participation.

b. Estimated Time--1-1 1/4 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

This section introduces a variety of design considerations that will aid public officials in designing and implementing effective citizen participation programs. Unfortunately many citizens and public officials think that establishing a viable participation structure is straightforward and simple; that is, get some people together and ask them what they want. It doesn't quite work that way. The design points presented in this section will help ensure that the techniques employed run smoothly and achieve the desired results.

A combination of lecture and discussion could be used with the emphasis on discussion. The instructor could start the discussion by asking the participants what things they would consider, or have considered, when setting up a participation mechanism. Factors other than those discussed in the text might be mentioned. The text highlights some of the most important factors to be considered. If suggestions are not forthcoming from

the participants, the instructor could lecture about a few of the design factors to give a sense for the type of things that need to be considered, and then ask again. The important point to stress is that developing a citizen participation structure requires attention to a wide variety of design issues if the effort is going to be a success.

C. Module II: Communicating With Citizens

1. Topic: Communication: Its Role in Citizen Participation; and Communication Techniques (TEXT: II. 1-15)

a. Objective

The major objectives of these two sections are to:

- illustrate that communication is an important part of any citizen participation effort; and
- present types of one-way and two-way techniques that could be used for communicating with citizens and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

b. Estimated Time--1 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

It is recommended that a combination of lecture and discussion be used to cover the material in these two sections. The instructor should briefly summarize the introductory material. Following the summarizing statement the instructor might ask participants to talk about specific problems which account for the communication problems between government and citizens. The instructor might have participants refer back to the case study presented at the beginning of Module I. Talk about how the lack of communication aggravated the situation. The purpose of this discussion is to have the participants appreciate that communication is an important aspect of citizen participation.

Some lecture should be devoted to covering the different kinds of one-way and two-way communication techniques. As the various communication techniques are covered, the instructor might ask the participants to discuss the relative advantages and disadvantages of each, and ask the participants to discuss experiences they might have had with the various techniques. Thus, the purpose of this discussion is to stimulate the participants to think analytically about different types of communication techniques.

To cover the material on eliciting citizen feedback, the instructor might have participants discuss experiences they might have had in trying to elicit feedback from citizens.

2. Topic: Local Government Credibility (TEXT: II. 16-19)

a. Objective

After completing this section the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- why establishing local government credibility is important in communication; and
- how credibility could be promoted.

b. Estimated Time--1/2 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

It is recommended that a combination of lecture and discussion be used to cover the information in this section. The instructor might begin by briefly reiterating the components of credibility that are discussed in the participant's manual. Then participants might be asked to identify experiences they have had in which establishing credibility has been a problem. Ask participants to speculate as to why credibility was a problem and how they dealt with this problem. To what extent was this problem caused by failing to anticipate the information needs of citizens and to what extent was it caused by failing to act the way citizens had expected the officials would act? In addition, the instructor might refer back to the case study in the first module and discuss how credibility was a problem in that particular situation. The purpose of this discussion is to sensitize the participants to the importance of maintaining credibility when interacting with citizens.

3. Topic: Role Ferspectives (TEXT: II. 20-22)

a. Objective

After completing this section the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- major differences in the role perspectives of citizens and officials and negative views that often accompany those perspectives; and
- what might be done to overcome differences in role perspectives.

b. Estimated Time--1/2 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor might begin a discussion of this material by asking course participants to write down a series of phrases which describe in general how they feel about citizen participants. Next have the course participants write down what they feel citizens think about local officials. The participants should be encouraged to write down whatever comes to mind--even if phrases contradict each other. Then discuss the phrases that were written by the various course participants. Have the participants challenge the validity of each other's phrases. In addition, the participants might discuss why people feel the way they do. Go over the list of dimensions of the role of city officials versus citizens included on II. 20 and II. 21 of the participant's manual. Do course participants agree with these dimensions? How do they feel these dimensions might affect behavior? The purpose of this discussion is to make the participants more aware of how differences in role perspectives might affect behavior.

D. Module III: Citizen Participation Mechanism

1. Topic: Overview to Mechanisms (TEXT: III. 1-10)

a. Objective

The major objectives of this submodule are to:

- provide an overview of the types of citizen participation mechanisms that will be covered in this curriculum;
- allow the participant to compare how each of the major groups of mechanisms relate to the four functions of citizen participation; and
- allow the participant to compare some of the advantages of alternative citizen participation strategies.

b. Estimated Time--1/2 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor should use a combination of lecture and discussion for covering the material in this submodule. Have the participant carefully scan Figures 1 and 2 in the text and then compare the various mechanisms. Concentrate both on the similarities and differences that exist among these mechanisms.

2. Topic: Long Term Convenings (TEXT: III. 11-30)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to familiarize the participant with the use of task forces and blue ribbon committees as a form of citizen participation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- different functions of task forces and blue ribbon committees;
- major design issues involved in implementing a task force or blue ribbon committee; and
- a variety of group techniques that could be used in a temporary convening.

b. Estimated Time--3 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

The primary modes for covering the material in this submodule should be discussion--supplemented by some lecture. The instructor should begin by defining the types of mechanisms included in this submodule (task forces and blue ribbon committees) and by discussing how these mechanisms relate to the four functions of citizen participation. The instructor might have participants refer back to Figures 1 and 2 in the previous submodule and compare this class of mechanisms to others that are covered in the curriculum. Ask participants the following question: "For what types of issues or problems would you recommend using a task force or blue ribbon committee as a means for promoting citizen participation?"

One way of organizing the discussion of implementation and major design issues is to use a modified nominal group technique. Ask the participants to individually write down their responses to the following question: "What are the important factors to consider in setting up, running, and maintaining a task force meeting?" After the participants have finished writing, go around the group in a round-robin fashion and elicit their responses. Group these responses on large sheets of paper in the front of the room, organizing them under "setting up a task force," "running a task force," and "maintaining a task force." After everyone has exhausted the comments on their individual lists, discuss whether any factors have been omitted. Once the group is satisfied that the list is relatively complete, use this list to organize the remainder of the session. Discuss each factor individually, asking why it is important and how it relates to actual experiences, either positive or negative, that the various participants have had. Raise factors that the group might have omitted and discuss their importance.

The advantages of this technique are that it exposes the participants to the use of a nominal group technique and shows them how this technique might work, it promotes discussion, and it encourages participants to relate the information to their own situations.

In addition to this approach, the following are other discussion questions that might be used for this material:

- ask participants to talk about positive and negative experiences they have had with task forces; direct the discussion to a consideration of those factors which made these experiences a success or failure;
- ask the participants what things they would be afraid of going wrong if they were to run a convening; have them speculate on what they would do to overcome these problems; and
- ask the participants to discuss the case study presented in the text (III. 25-27) and relate the example to the major design points outlined in the text.

These are general discussion questions that would allow the instructor to integrate most of the design material from the participant's manual into the discussion. The instructor should then summarize the major points of this submodule concentrating on the material highlighted in the summary section of the participant's manual.

3. Topic: Short Term Convenings (TEXT: III. 31-41)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to promote understanding of how a public hearing or briefing could be used effectively as a citizen participation mechanism. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- how public hearings and briefings relate to the four functions of citizen participation; and
- major design consideration involved in implementing a public hearing or briefing.

b. Estimated Time--1 hour

c. Teaching Methodology

The primary mode for covering this material is discussion. This can be supplemented by some lecture. Public hearings and briefings are a very common form of citizen participation. The instructor could have participants

compare this mechanism to others that are discussed in this module. A natural way to cover the material is to have participants discuss their own experiences with this type of mechanism. Have them talk about positive and negative experiences. Do they feel the design information (III. 35-37 of the text) could have helped avoid some of the problems they have encountered? In addition, the instructor could have the participants discuss how useful they feel this mechanism is for promoting citizen participation and in what situations it might be used.

4. Topic: Territorial Groups (TEXT: III. 43-60)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to familiarize the participant with the use of territorial groups as a form of citizen participation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- different types of territorial groups that have formal connections to government;
- different citizen participation functions served by territorial groups; and
- major design issues involved in implementing territorial groups.

b. Estimated Time--3 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor could use a combination of lecture and discussion in order to cover the material in this submodule. The instructor might begin a discussion of this material by asking the participants to consider the advantages and disadvantages of having citizens participate in governmental affairs as members of groups, rather than as individuals.

Then the instructor could ask participants to discuss any type of territorial or neighborhood groups that presently exist in the city. Talk about how well these groups presently fulfill the four functions of citizen participation. The purpose of this discussion is to stimulate the participant to begin to assess the adequacy of the present situation in the city. If the city does not presently have any territorial groups, the instructor could have the participants compare this mechanism with the two mechanisms that have already been covered to see how each relates to the functions of citizen participation.

Next, if the city already has a system of territorial groups, the instructor could have participants generally evaluate the present situation

according to the design points listed in the participant's manual. For example, the following illustrates some of the questions that could be asked around each major design point:

- Clarity of purpose--How might the present purpose be expanded or clarified to improve the operation? Do city officials and citizens agree on the purpose of the group?
- Membership--How is membership presently determined? Does the group experience large fluctuations in its membership?
- Territorial Boundaries--How are the boundaries determined? How successful has been the present configuration?
- Staff--Do the groups that presently exist have any staff? How adequate are the amount of resources at the groups' disposal?
- Maintaining Community Interests--Has it been a problem to maintain community interest in the project?

If territorial groups do not presently exist in the city, the instructor could ask participants to speculate how these design considerations might be handled if a territorial group or system of territorial groups were set up in the city.

5. Topic: Functional Continuing Groups (TEXT: III. 61-74)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to familiarize the reader with the use of functionally-oriented, continuing mechanisms as a form of citizen participation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- different types of functionally-oriented, continuing mechanisms;
- different citizen participation functions served by these mechanisms; and
- major design issues involved in implementing functionally-oriented continuing mechanisms.

b. Estimated Time--1 1/2 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor could use a combination of lecture and discussion to cover the material in this submodule. Almost every city has some type of

functional continuing group. The instructor should try to obtain information before the session concerning the variety of functional groups that operate in a particular locality. The instructor could then analyze this information concerning eligibility requirements that might exist, what types of people are members and what specific functions these groups perform. The instructor could then use this information as a starting point for discussing how functional groups could be used to promote the four functions of citizen participation. How could these groups be reorganized in order to make them more effective citizen participation mechanisms? Are there any other functional groups that are needed in the city?

6. Topic: Decentralization (TEXT: III. 75-91)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to familiarize the reader with the use of decentralization as a form of citizen participation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- different types of neighborhood facilities;
- different functions of neighborhood facilities;
- major design issues involved in implementing a neighborhood facility; and
- arguments for and against political decentralization.

b. Estimated Time--2 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor could use a combination of lecture and discussion to cover the material in this submodule. The instructor might begin this section by defining the difference between administrative and political decentralization, and by discussing types of citizen participation mechanisms that could be considered examples of administrative decentralization. Then talk about how neighborhood facilities could relate to the four functions of citizen participation. It is important that the participant understand that the success of these mechanisms as forms of citizen participation is heavily dependent upon the types of activities carried out by the neighborhood facility.

After a brief opening lecture, the instructor might ask if any participant has had experience with neighborhood facilities. Get the participants to specify what were the purposes of that facility and how do they feel those purposes could have been expanded. The objective of this discussion is to stimulate participants to think about the purposes of administrative decentralization and to realize that once a neighborhood facility exists, it could be adapted to accomplish a number of things.

Also, the instructor should direct the discussion to the limitations of administrative decentralization. Given the broad, general purposes of this mechanism, what other citizen participation mechanisms discussed in this module would also be appropriate--that is, accomplish similar purposes. The purpose of this discussion would be to reiterate previous material and to cause the participant to realize that a number of mechanisms could accomplish similar ends. In addition, the instructor might ask the participants to specify in what situations administrative decentralization would be most appropriate. While there are no set answers to these questions, they provide the vehicle for the instructor to introduce a good deal of the material in this submodule and to integrate this material with other submodules.

In order to cover the material on implementation, the instructor might have the group discuss the case study on Boston's City Halls (they might refer to the Nordinger book which presents more information about the situation). The instructor should guide the discussion to design issues by asking such questions as:

- If the participant were staffing a neighborhood facility, what type of personnel would be desirable?
- How would the participant maintain communication with the centralized authority?
- What problems would be encountered in building citizen trust and credibility in the facility, and how would the participant handle these problems? and
- What kinds of political problems would the participants expect to encounter by establishing neighborhood facilities?

These are examples of a few of the questions that might be asked. The objective of these questions is to get the participant to realize some of the major design questions that need to be addressed in administrative decentralization and to begin speculating how those questions might be answered.

The instructor might cover the material on political decentralization by having the participants analyze the arguments to determine what are value statements (which cannot be proved) and what are statements of expected outcomes (which are empirical questions). Discussion about political decentralization often degenerates into emotional disagreements. The purpose of this exercise is to cause the participants to deal with the situation rationally by separating values from facts.

7. Topic: Grievance Processing Mechanisms (TEXT: III. 93-114)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to familiarize the participant with the use of grievance processing mechanisms as a form of citizen

participation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be aware of and able to specify:

- different types of grievance processing mechanisms:
- different citizen participation functions served by grievance processing mechanisms; and
- major design issues involved in implementing grievance processing mechanisms.

b. Estimated Time--2 1/2 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

Material in this module can be covered by using a combination of lecture and discussion. The instructor might begin by asking participants how they presently handle complaints in their city. Depending upon the responses the instructor might ask some of the following questions:

- Does the same person always handle complaints?
- Are the complaints documented when they are made?
- Does anyone ever follow-up to determine if complaints were handled to the citizen's satisfaction?
- Does the city ever systematically analyze the variety of complaints that are made in order to determine any patterns?

After participants have answered the previous series of questions, the instructor might ask them to speculate as to what problems the present way of processing grievances presents for the public official and for the citizen.

The purpose of these questions is to get the participants to analyze how they presently handle complaints and to begin to assess how they might change that system.

Next, the instructor might provide a brief lecture, which outlines the two main forms of grievance processing--complaint bureaus and ombudsmen--and relates these mechanisms to the functions of citizen participation. In addition, the instructor could provide an overview of major design considerations involved in implementing these types of mechanisms.

After the lecture, the instructor could ask the participants how they might design a grievance processing mechanism for their own city (or if one presently exists, how they might redesign the present system). Go through each of the design points and have the participants discuss how each point could be answered for their own situation.

8. Topic: Surveys (TEXT: III. 115-141)

a. Objectives

The overall goal of this submodule is to promote understanding of how survey research could be used as a citizen participation mechanism and what design issues need to be considered in implementation. After completing this submodule, the participant should be more aware of and able to specify:

- different functions of survey;
- different types of information that could be obtained from a survey;
- major design factors affecting the success of survey research as a citizen participation mechanism;
- different types of surveys and the advantages and disadvantages of each type;
- how one can make inferences about the opinions of the entire population by interviewing a subset; and
- steps involved in designing a survey.

b. Estimated Time--3 1/2 hours

c. Teaching Methodology

The instructor might use a combination of lecture and discussion in order to cover the material in this submodule. Some in-service audiences may have a negative bias towards survey research. This could involve feelings that information from surveys is not very useful or that survey results are not accurate. For an in-service audience, you might begin the session by asking the group if anyone has had any experience with surveys, and if so, what was the nature of the experience. Or, the group might be asked directly how useful surveys are for local government and do they believe that surveys potentially can produce useful information. The point of these two sets of questions is to determine the extent of bias towards surveys that exist in the group. If negative feelings appear, ask the group to specify why they had a negative experience or why they believe surveys are not useful or accurate. The instructor might be able to show that key design points noted in the participant's manual were not followed and perhaps produced the negative experiences or attitudes. If this bias is not addressed, group receptivity to the material will be low.

The instructor may want to discuss if the group feels that surveys are a legitimate form of citizen participation. Compare the type of participation and information generated through this technique with the citizen participation mechanisms discussed previously in other submodules. Relate this discussion to the purposes of the mechanism discussed in the

first section. Ask participants to speculate on the types of situations in which surveys might be appropriate (such as community development planning) and how surveys might be complemented by other data sources or other types of citizen participation mechanisms.

The section on the type of information generated by surveys is very important. The instructor could cover this information by going over each of the examples presented in the participant's manual and asking the group (if in-service) to speculate how (if at all) they could use this information in their own situation.

The information on the survey process might be primarily dealt with by lecture and by spending time relating some of the design points of implementing a survey to the negative attitudes or experiences that were discussed in the beginning of the session.

VI. Workshop Evaluation

A participant evaluation of the workshop can provide useful information for the instructor. The primary question to be answered is whether or not the workshop achieved the intended objectives. When designing the evaluation, the instructor must keep in mind the purpose of the workshop; that is, increase the level of awareness and familiarity, increase the amount of knowledge, or a combination of both. In addition, evaluative information can be collected about such things as:

- the difficulty of the material;
- its usefulness;
- how interesting it was;
- whether or not the workshop met the expectations of the participants; and
- participant satisfaction with the workshop.

This kind of information can aid the instructor in determining whether or not further sessions might be required with the participants. In addition, finding out what worked and what did not will help in planning future workshops.

The following examples illustrate some of the types of questions that would be appropriate for a workshop evaluation. This particular workshop covered only certain sections of each module. The purposes of the workshop were to increase the familiarity of the participants with the topics covered, and to transfer a general knowledge about the topics. This example also contains questions about overall considerations: what did the participants like and what did they not like, the usefulness and difficulty of the material, was enough presented, etc.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP EVALUATION

A. Familiarity

INSTRUCTIONS: We are interested in knowing how successful the workshop has been in increasing your familiarity with the topics as they are covered in the curricular materials. In addition, we would like to know how familiar you feel you are with these topics before you attended the workshop. On a scale from 1 to 10 (where 1 represents low familiarity and 10 represents high familiarity) use an "A" (after) to indicate your familiarity with each topic after the workshop and a "B" (before) to indicate your familiarity with each topic before the workshop.

	Low Familiarity									High Familiarity
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Reasons for promoting citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Functions served by citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Constraints of liabilities associated with involving citizens	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Different communications techniques to strengthen citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. Ways that grievance processing mechanisms can be used to promote citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. Important design issues to consider in the implementation of grievance processing mechanisms	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. Ways in which surveys can be used by local government	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. Important design issues that should be considered in the implementation of a survey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. Ways that continuing territorial groups that have formal connections to government can be used to promote citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10. Important design issues that should be considered in the implementation of territorial groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11. Ways that administrative decentralization can be used to promote citizen participation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12. Important design issues that should be considered in the implementation of administrative decentralization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

B. Knowledge Questions

1. List three reasons for promoting citizen participation.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

2. List four broad functions served by citizen participation.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

3. List four constraints or liabilities associated with involving citizens in governmental planning and decisionmaking.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

4. List six basic design factors to be considered for facilitating effective citizen participation.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

   f. _____

5. List one example of each of the following types of communications techniques that can be used to strengthen citizen participation.

   a. Written One-Way Techniques _____

   b. Informal and Temporary Techniques _____

   c. Formal and Permanent Techniques _____

   d. Special Purpose Techniques _____

   e. Mass Communication Techniques _____

6. List two types of continuing territorial groups that have formal connections to government.

   a. _____

   b. _____

7. List four different design issues that have an impact on how successful territorial groups are or that need to be considered in the implementation of such a mechanism.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

8. List three major ways surveys could be used by local government.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

9. The following questions deal with the three major types of surveys: mail, telephone, and personal. Answer each question assuming an equal number of questions and an equal number of respondents.

   a. Of the three major types, which one is usually the most expensive?

      (1) Mail
      (2) Telephone
      (3) Personal

   b. Of the three major types, which one takes the least amount of time to collect the data?

      (1) Mail
      (2) Telephone
      (3) Personal

   c. Of the three major types, which one provides the most flexibility for asking questions?

      (1) Mail
      (2) Telephone
      (3) Personal

10. What are two major factors affecting the quality of the sample?

    a. _____

    b. _____

11. What are two major design considerations identified in this curriculum that will affect the success of the survey?

    a. _____

    b. _____

12. List two types of grievance processing mechanisms.

    a. _____

    b. _____

13. List three different design issues that have an impact on how successful grievance processing mechanisms are or that need to be considered in the implementation of such a mechanism.

    a. _____

    b. _____

    c. _____

14. List two types of neighborhood facilities.

    a. _____

    b. _____

15. Provide an example of how a neighborhood facility could perform the following functions of citizen participation.

    a. Information Function

    _____

    _____

    b. Involvement Function

    _____

    _____

16. List three major design issues or considerations involved in implementing a neighborhood facility.

    a. _____

    b. _____

    c. _____

C. Overall Considerations

1. What did you like most about the material?

2. What did you like least about the material?

3. Were the objectives clearly stated for this material? _____ YES _____ NO

4. Do you think enough material was presented to achieve the objectives as stated in the curriculum?

_____ YES _____ NO

5. How much of the material was difficult to understand?

a. All of it
b. Most of it
c. Some of it
d. Not very much of it
e. None of it

6. How interesting did you find this material?

a. Very interesting
b. Somewhat interesting
c. Not very interesting
d. Not at all interesting

7. How useful did you find this material?

a. Very useful
b. Somewhat useful
c. Not very useful
d. Not at all useful

8. How useful do you feel this material would be for other officials in cities that are interested in establishing citizen participation mechanisms?

a. Very useful
b. Somewhat useful
c. Not very useful
d. Not at all useful

9. I came away from this course with:

a. More than I expected
b. What I expected, favorable
c. What I expected, unfavorable
d. Less than what I expected

Why? _____

_____

10. Overall, how satisfied were you with the material contained in the curriculum?

a. Very satisfied
b. Somewhat satisfied

Why? _____

_____

c. Somewhat dissatisfied
d. Very dissatisfied

Why? _____

_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Stanley V. and John E. Moore (eds.). Establishing Ombudsman Offices: Recent Experiences in the United States. Berkeley, California: Institute of Government Studies, 1972.

Arnstein, Sherry. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners. Volume 35, (July, 1966) 216-224.

Austin, D. "Resident Participation: Political Mobilization or Organizational Co-optation?," Public Administration Review, 32, Special Issue, Sept., 1972.

Babbie, Earl. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald D. Hursh. Survey Research. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Bent, Alan Edward. The Politics of Law Enforcement: Conflict and Power in Urban Communities. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, 1974.

Boone, R. "Reflections on Citizen Participation and the Economic Opportunity Act," Public Administration Review, 32, Special Issue, Sept., 1972.

Brown, David S., "The Management of Advisory Committees: An Assignment for the '70's," Public Administration Review, 32, No. 4 (July/August 1972), 334-342.

Bruyn, Severyn T. Communities in Action: Patterns and Practices. New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Press, 1970.

Burke, Edmund. "Citizen Participation Strategies," Journal of the American Institute of Planners. 34, Number 3, 287-294.

Cahn, Edgar, and Barry A. Passet. Citizen Participation Effecting Community Change. Published in cooperation with the New Jersey Community Action Training Institution, Praeger Special Studies. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Camille Cates. "Using Citizen Surveys: Three Approaches." Municipal Management Innovation Series, No. 15. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, February, 1977.

Center for Governmental Studies. Local Chief Executives' Perceptions of Policymaking and Management Needs. Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. February, 1975.

Citizens Budget Commission. Decentralization in the Department of Sanitation. New York, 1973.

Clavel, Pierre. "Planners and Citizens Boards: Some Applications of Social Theory to the Problem of Plan Implementation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 34,No. 3, (May 1968), 130-139.

Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. Local Community Structure and Civic Participation. Chicago: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, May, 1968.

Cox, Fred, John Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John Tropman (eds.). Strategies of Community Organization. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Dodge, William R. "Public Involvement in Local Government in the 1970's," Management Information Service. Volume 6, Number1, January, 1974.

Dubbink, Mollie. "Unique Goals for Dallas Program Systematically Involves Thousands of Citizens." American Institute of Planners Newsletter, 4 (December, 1969), 5-7.

Paul L. Erdos. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Falkson, Joseph L. An Evaluation of Alternative Models of Citizen Participation in Urban Bureaucracy. Ann Arbor: Programs in Health Planning, School of Public Health, University of Michigan, 1971.

Farr, Walter and Lance Liebman and Jeffrey S. Wood. Decentralizing City Government. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Frederickson, G. (ed). Neighborhood Control in the 1970's Politics, Administration, and Citizen Participation. New York: Chandler, 1974.

Gellhorn, Walter. Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Godschalk, David. Participation, Planning, and Exchange in Old and New Communities: A Collaborative Paradigm. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Center for Urban and Regional Studies, 1972.

Greifer, Julian L. Community Action for Social Change. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Grollman, J. E. The Decentralization of Municipal Services. International City Management Association 3, 2 (February, 1971), 1.

Grosser, Charles F. New Directions in Community Organization. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Hallman, Howard W. Community Control: A Study of Community Corporations and Neighborhood Boards. Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1969.

Hallman, H. W. Neighborhood Control of Public Programs. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Hallman, H. W. Neighborhood Government in a Metropolitan Setting. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Sage Library of Social Research, Volume 12, 1974.

Havelock, Ronald G., et al. Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.

Hill, Larry B. Ombudsmen, Bureaucracy, and Democracy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Hutcheson, John D., Jr., and Frank X. Steggert. Organized Citizen Participation in Urban Areas. Atlanta, Georgia: Center for Research in Social Change, Emory University, n.d.

Hyman, Herbert H. "Planning with Citizens: Two Styles." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35(1969):105-112.

Kasperson, R. Participation, Decentralization, and Advocacy Planning. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1974.

Kotler, Milton. Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

May, Judith V. Citizen Participation: A Review of the Literature. Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography 210-211. Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians, 1971.

Mogulof, Melvin. Citizen Participation: The Local Perspective. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1970.

Mogulof, M. "Coalition to Adversary: Citizen Participation in Three Federal Programs." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35(1969):225-232.

Moser, C. A., and G. Kalton. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. (2nd ed.) New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

National School Public Relations Association. Citizens Advisory Committees: Public Participation Increases; Guides Change in American Education. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.

Nordlinger, E. A. Decentralizing the City: A Study of Boston's Little City Halls. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1972.

Padrow, B. "Public Hearings, Public Officials, and the Hot Seat." Nations Cities, February, 1974.

Rothblatt, Donald N. "Rational Planning Reexamined." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 37(1971):26-37.

Routh, Frederick B. "Goals for Dallas: More Participation than Power-Sharing." City, 5(March-April, 1971):49-53.

Rowat, Donald C. (ed.). The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender. (2nd ed.) London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1965, 1968.

Schoop, E. Jack, and John E. Hirten. "The San Francisco Bay Plan: Combining Policy with Police Power." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 37(1971):2-10.

Sigel, Roberta S. "Citizens Committee--Advice vs. Consent." Transaction, 5(May, 1967):47-52.

Sloan, A. K. Citizen Participation in Transportation Planning: The Boston Experience. New York: Ballinger, 1974.

Spiegel, Hans B. C. Citizen Participation in Urban Development, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

Spiegel, H. B. C., and Stephen D. Mittenthal. Neighborhood Power and Control: Implications for Urban Planning. New York: Columbia University, 1968.

Stenberg, C. W. The Grass Roots Government: Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Urban Areas. Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1972.

Tibbles, Lance, and John H. Hollands. Buffalo Citizens Administrative Service: An Ombudsman Demonstration Project. Berkeley, California: University of California Institute of Governmental Studies, 1970.

Trecker, Harleigh B. Citizen Boards at Work: New Challenges to Effective Action. New York: Association Press, 1970.

Unger, Sherman. "Citizen Participation: A Challenge to HUD and the Community." The Urban Lawyer. Volume II, Number 1, Winter, 1970.

U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Model Cities Program: A Comparative Analysis of the Planning Process in Eleven Cities. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Van de Ven, A., and A. Delbercq. Guidelines for Leaders in Conducting Nominal Group Meetings. Madison, Wisconsin: Center for the Study of Program Administration, 1971.

Verba, Sidney. "Democratic Participation." The Annals of the American Academy. 373(1967):53-78.

Warner, Katherine P. Public Participation in Water Resource Planning. Arlington, Virginia: National Water Commission, July, 1971.

Washnis, George J. Little City Halls. Washington, D.C.: Center for Governmental Studies, 1971.

Washnis, G. J. Municipal Decentralization and Neighborhood Resources. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Webb, Kenneth, and Harry P. Hatry. Obtaining Citizen Feedback: The Application of Citizen Surveys to Local Governments. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1973.

Weinberg, Eve. Community Surveys With Local Talent. Chicago, Illinois: National Opinion Research, 1971.

Weiss, Carol H., and Harry P. Hatry. An Introduction to Sample Surveys for Government Managers. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, March, 1971.

Weissman, Harold H. Community Councils and Community Control: The Workings of Democratic Mythology. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1970.

Wolpert, Julian, Anthony Humphrey, and John Seley. Metropolitan Neighborhoods: Participation and Conflict Over Change. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1972.

Wyner, Alan J. (ed.). Executive Ombudsmen in the United States. Berkeley, California: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1973.

Yin, Robert K., et al., Citizen Organizations: Increasing Client Control Over Services. Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation, April, 1973.